



City of Seattle

Gregory J. Nickels, Mayor

Department of Design, Construction and Land Use

D. M. Sugimura, Director

**CITY OF SEATTLE
ANALYSIS AND DECISION OF THE DIRECTOR
OF THE DEPARTMENT OF DESIGN, CONSTRUCTION AND LAND USE**

Application Number: 9901977

Applicant Name: Nora Liu for Home Sight

Address of Proposal: 833 Davis Place South
(aka 813 Davis Place South and 1746 South Charles Street)

SUMMARY OF PROPOSED ACTION

Master Use Permit to establish the use for the future construction of two, two-story residential structures containing a total of 34 units, one building having 10 units and the other 24 units. Parking for 42 vehicles would be provided in a partially below grade garage located within the larger structure and two additional barrier free parking stalls would be provided on site.

The following approvals are required:

Design Review pursuant to Chapter 23.41 Seattle Municipal Code (SMC) with the following departures from the applicable development standards:

- 1) *Lot coverage.* SMC 23.45.010(A)(2) limits lot coverage to 40% for non-townhouse structures in the L2 zone. Proposed lot coverage totals 43%.
- 2) *Structure width.* SMC Table 23.45.011(A) limits maximum structure width in L2 zones to 50 feet (with modulation per SMC 23.45.012). Proposed Building One measures 261 feet wide along the Davis Place South frontage.
- 3) *Side façade modulation.* For corner lots, SMC 23.45.012(B) requires modulation for side facades wider than 30 feet. Along the South Charles Street facade, proposed Buildings 1 and 2 measure 40 feet in width without required modulation.
- 4) *Interior façade modulation.* SMC 23.45.012(C) requires modulation for interior facades exceeding 40 feet in width. Proposed Buildings One and Two have interior facades of 76 feet in width without the modulation. These two

interior facades are: 1) the east elevation of Building Two and 2) the west elevation of Building One where it directly faces Building Two.

SEPA - Environmental Determination - Chapter 25.05 SMC

Variance – to allow more than the maximum height in a Lowrise 2 Zone (SMC 23.45.009): 25 feet required – 31.79 feet proposed.

Related Actions

Project #9808709 – Limited Environmentally Critical Areas (ECA) Exemption - ECA steep slopes; approved December 23, 1998.

Project #2104373 – Lot Boundary Adjustment – as yet unrecorded; approved by DCLU January 17, 2003.

SEPA DETERMINATION: ☐ Exempt ☐ DNS ☐ MDNS ☐ EIS

☒ DNS with conditions

☐ DNS involving non-exempt grading, or demolition,
or involving another agency with jurisdiction.

BACKGROUND DATA

Site Description

The approximately 40,698 square-foot project site is located on the west side of Davis Place S. between S. Dearborn Street to the north and S. Charles Street to the south in the Jackson Park Neighborhood of Seattle's central area. The property is also described as Parcel A of LBA 2104373. The triangular shaped parcel is undeveloped and has a thick under story of brush and shrubs with several mature deciduous and evergreen trees interspersed throughout. The topography of the site generally slopes downward from the east to the west. A large depression created by previous grading activity is located along the southwest portion of the property. An unimproved 16-foot wide public right-of-way, used as the Cedar River water main corridor, is located along the western property boundary. Access to the site is available by the three abutting streets which are all paved and have curbs, gutters and sidewalks. S. Dearborn Street at this location is classified as a residential street although it is heavily used as an east/west corridor through the neighborhood. Davis Place S. is a relatively quiet residential street as is S. Charles Street.

Rainier Avenue S. is located downhill, two blocks to the west. The property is within a Lowrise Two (L-2) residential zoning district which has a twenty five-foot height limit. Future development is subject to Environmentally Critical Areas general development

standards and landslide hazard standards. The site is also within the Central Residential Urban Village neighbor planning boundaries.

Area Development

The immediate neighborhood is a mixture of residential uses located upslope from the more active commercial development along Rainier Avenue S. Single family residences and an apartment complex are located along the opposite side of Davis Place S.; a new 24-unit multifamily, co-housing development abuts the project site to the west. A further mix of single family, duplex and small multi-family structures are located to the north and south. The co-housing property to the west is zoned Neighborhood Commercial Three with a residential overlay (NC3/R-40), the block face to the east is split zoned Single Family residential (SF5000) and Lowrise Duplex/Triplex (LDT), to the north properties are zoned Lowrise One (L-1) or SF5000; and to the south, properties are also zoned SF5000 .

Proposal Description

The applicant proposes to construct 34 units of residential housing in two structures, identified as Building One and Building Two. The larger structure, Building One, would front Davis Place S. and would look from the street side as three separate, two story structures although the base would be a partially underground garage providing parking for 42 vehicles. Each module would consist of eight units, with a single front entry and 15 feet of landscaped courtyard in between. The smaller structure, Building Two, would be situated to the southwest portion of the site and would also have two stories, with ten units.

Because of an existing topographical depression on the site, a portion of the southwest corner of Building One would exceed the maximum height limit allowed in the Lowrise 2 zone. The maximum height allowed is 25 feet and the proposed height of the building's corner would be 31.79 feet. The remaining portion of Building One would meet the required height as well as all of Building Two.

The proposal also includes establishing a "p-patch" community garden, available to the surrounding neighborhood, along the west side, center of the property and dedicating an additional 14-foot wide strip to the existing public utility easement along the west end of the property.

Public Comment

Several members of the surrounding neighborhood attended the initial Early Design Guidance, Design Review Board meeting held June 29, 1999 and the subsequent December 14, 1999, board meeting. All comments were considered and integrated into the Board's subsequent development priorities for the proposal. The public comment notice for the subject Master Use Permit was published October 31, 2002 and was extended through November 27, 2002. Several comments were received from the residences of the adjacent co-housing project expressing concern regarding the increased number of units proposed, increased vehicular traffic and the loss of open space. The co-housing project was not constructed at the time of the first public discussion of the proposal and the residents were

not involved in the initial planning process. The applicant held a meeting with these neighbors and discussed their concerns. At the subsequent Design Review Board meeting two neighbors attended.

A second public notice that included the proposed variance request was published on January 30, 2003 and the comment period closed February 12, 2002. No comments were received.

DESIGN REVIEW PROCESS

Early Design Guidance

On June 29, 1999 and December 14, 1999 the Southeast Seattle Design Review Board met in an early design guidance public meetings to consider the site and the objectives of the applicant. After visiting the site, considering the analysis of the site and context provided by the proponents, and hearing public comment, the Design Review Board members identified the following Citywide Design Guidelines as high priorities to be considered in the final proposed design:

A. SITE PLANNING

- A-1 Responding to Site Characteristics. The siting of buildings should respond to specific site conditions and opportunities such as non-rectangular lots, location on prominent intersections, unusual topography, and significant vegetation.**

The Board praised the applicant for doing a good job with a demanding site and endorsed the most recent site design for responding well to the street slope and reducing curb-cuts.

Further reduction of curb cuts and garage doors along Davis Place was endorsed.

- A-3 Entrances Visible from the Street. Entries should be clearly identifiable and visible from the street.**

The fourplexes should include well-marked pedestrian entrance routes, separated from driveways.

B. HEIGHT, BULK AND SCALE

- B-1 Height, Bulk and Scale Compatibility. Projects should be compatible with the scale of development anticipated by the applicable Land Use Policies for the surrounding area and should be sited and designed to provide a sensitive transition to near-by, less-intensive zones. Projects on zone edges should be developed in a manner that creates a step in perceived height, bulk and scale between the anticipated development potential of the adjacent zones.**

The board approved of the compatible scale between the proposed project and the adjacent Lowrise and Single-Family zones.

C. ARCHITECTURAL ELEMENTS AND MATERIALS

- C-4 Exterior Finish Materials. Building exteriors should be constructed of durable and maintainable materials that are attractive even when viewed up close. Materials that have texture, pattern, or lend themselves to a high quality of detailing are encouraged.**

The project applicant proposes to use vinyl siding for the primary exterior cladding. While the Board did not object to this choice, it did encourage the applicant to create variety and contrast between the different structures through variations in color, a range of siding profiles, and imaginative detailing.

D. PEDESTRIAN ENVIRONMENT

- D-2 Blank Walls. Buildings should avoid large blank walls facing the street, especially near sidewalks. Where blank walls are unavoidable, they should receive design treatment to increase pedestrian comfort and interest.**
- D-3 Retaining Walls. Retaining walls near a public sidewalk that extend higher than eye level should be avoided where possible. Where high retaining walls are unavoidable, they should be designed to reduce their impact on pedestrian comfort and to increase the visual interest along the streetscape.**

Board members encouraged the applicant to soften the appearance of the proposed retaining wall off of S. Charles Street. Suggestions included employing a battered wall or stepping the wall, using a large rockery and landscaping from above and below. If a fence is placed atop the wall, the fence should be pulled back to allow for a planting area.

- D-6 Screening of Dumpsters, Utilities and Service Areas. Building sites should locate service elements like trash dumpsters, loading docks and mechanical equipment away from the street front where possible. When elements such as dumpsters, utility meters, mechanical units and service areas cannot be located away from the street front, they should be situated and screened from view and should not be located in the pedestrian right-of-way.**

Dumpsters should be either located within the structure or shielded by walls and landscaping.

- D-7 Personal Safety and Security. Project design should consider opportunities for enhancing personal safety and security in the environment under review.**

The Board directed the applicant to use exterior lighting to promote personal safety.

E. LANDSCAPING**E-1 Landscaping to Reinforce Design Continuity with Adjacent Sites. Where possible and where there is not another overriding concern, landscaping should reinforce the character of neighboring properties and abutting streetscape.**

The Board strongly supported the proponents plan to integrate the proposal with the two projects to the west and encouraged the applicant to develop a comprehensive landscape and streetscape scheme. The Board enthusiastically endorsed the plan to develop a community garden on this site.

Development Standard Departures

The initial proposal considered by the Board was for three, four-unit townhouse structures and three single family residences. Contemplated development standard departures included front yard setback, structure width, and transfer public open space to a community garden. The Board indicated a favorable response to the departure requests.

DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

The Design Review Board met on January 28, 2003 to review the applicant's formal project proposal developed in response to their identified priorities. At this public meeting site plans, elevations, color renderings, and landscaping plans were presented for the members' consideration. Three (3) members of the public attended with one providing comment and discussion throughout the Board's deliberation. The comments presented at this final meeting were to reiterate the previous comments provided earlier in the Design Review process.

Development Standard Departures

At the final Design Review meeting the applicant proposed the following development standard departures from the applicable development standards contained in the Land Use Code:

STANDARD	REQUIREMENT	REQUEST
1. Lot coverage.	SMC 23.45.010(A)(2) limits lot coverage to 40% for non-townhouse structures in the L2 zone. For the 40,698-square foot subject site, the maximum allowable lot coverage is 16,279 square feet.	Proposed lot coverage totals 17,692 square feet (43% lot coverage; 1,413 square feet in excess of the code maximum.
2. Structure width.	SMC Table 23.45.011(A)	Proposed Building One

	limits maximum structure width in L2 zones to 50 feet (with modulation per SMC 23.45.012).	measures 261 feet wide along the Davis Place South frontage. Proposed Building Two measures 40 feet in width.
3. Side façade modulation.	For corner lots, SMC 23.45.012(B) requires modulation for side facades wider than 30 feet	Proposed Building One measures 261 feet wide along the Davis Place South frontage. Proposed Building Two measures 40 feet in width.
4. Interior façade modulation	SMC 23.45.012(C) requires modulation for interior facades exceeding 40 feet in width.	Proposed Buildings One and Two have interior facades of 76 feet in width without the modulation. These two interior facades are 1) the east elevation of Building Two, and 2) the west elevation of Building One where it directly faces Building Two.

Recommendation

After considering the site and context, hearing public comment, reconsidering the previously identified design priorities, and reviewing the plans, the Design Review Board members recommended approval of the subject design and requested departures with four conditions, as cited below. (The authority for the recommended conditions is provided by the Design Review guideline(s) referred by letter and number in parentheses after the recommendation.). The Board also indicated that staff could work directly with the applicant to develop the recommended design solutions without bringing the solutions back to the Board for further consideration.

1. Provide a quality material such as hardy board for the structures siding if feasible and a strong color scheme similar to other Home Sight projects in the area. (C-4)
2. Break up the continuous mass of Building One along the western facade; provide a continuous ground treatment of the interior courtyard/ landscaping area separating the three modules of Building One. (D2, D3 and D5)
3. Provide a gate way feature into p-patch community garden that celebrates the entrance to the garden. (E-3)

4. Design a pleasant, usable area in the courtyard/ landscaped space if possible in between modules of Building One. (E-2)

These recommendations were based on the plans submitted at the January 28, 2003, final Design Review meeting. Design, siting, or architectural details not specifically identified or altered in these recommendations are expected to remain as presented in the plans presented at the meeting.

DECISION - DESIGN REVIEW

Prior to the issuance of the final building permit for the proposal all design conditions and consideration must be incorporated into the building plans. Accordingly, the proposed design is **GRANTED** subject to the conditions noted at the end of this report. Based on the review and concurrence of the Design Review Board for the referenced Departures, each of the Departures are also **GRANTED**.

ANALYSIS - VARIANCE

1. *Because of unusual conditions applicable to the subject property, including size, shape, topography, location or surroundings, which were not created by the owner or applicant, the strict application of this Land Use Code would deprive the property of rights and privileges enjoyed by other properties in the same zone or vicinity;*

It appears from historic aerial photos that the southeast corner of the site was excavated sometime between 1936 and 1946. This is an unusual condition, applicable to the subject property, which was not created by the owner or applicant. The Land Use Code allows a maximum 25-foot height from the existing or proposed grade whichever is lower to the top plate of a structure. On other properties, a building meeting this requirement could be three-stories tall. However, on subject site, the existing graded cut begins 13 feet from the property line and the existing slope falls 16 vertical feet in 25 feet of horizontal distance. As a result of this cut together with the literal interpretation of the height requirements, it is only possible to build a one-story building on the site. In this instance, the strict application of the Land Use Code height requirements would deprive the property of rights and privileges enjoyed by other properties in the same zone and vicinity.

2. *The requested variance does not go beyond the minimum necessary to afford relief, and does not constitute a grant of special privilege inconsistent with the limitations upon other properties in the vicinity and zone in which the subject property is located;*

The variance would allow for additional height as it is directly affected by previous grading on the property. The request is for a maximum of 6.79 feet on the portions of Building One which sit directly over the graded depression. The structure as seen from its front side, along Davis Place S., is a two-story residential building with 8-foot floor to ceiling heights or 16.24 feet tall as defined by the Land Use Code. The finish floor elevation would be located approximately two feet below the grade of the sidewalk in front of the structure, thereby,

providing the minimum necessary to afford relief. Because of unique topographical limitations, the additional height in this instance would not be a grant of special privilege.

3. *The granting of the variance will not be materially detrimental to the public welfare or injurious to the property or improvements in the zone or vicinity in which the subject property is located;*

No significant impacts to the neighborhood improvements are anticipated as a result of the proposal. This portion of Davis Place S. is a quiet residential street characterized by similar residential properties having one and two-story structures. The reduced height of the structure facing the street would have minimal impact on the neighborhood character. Landscaping and other measures have been taken to soften the bulk of the structure along the west façade most directly affected by the increased height. Also, proposed Building Two would be interspersed between the western façade and the adjacent co-housing project to the west. Granting the height variances would not be materially detrimental to the public welfare or injurious to the property or improvements in zone or vicinity in which the subject property is located.

4. *The literal interpretation and strict application of the applicable provisions or requirements of this Land Use Code would cause undue hardship or practical difficulties;*

Strict application of the Land Use Code would only allow a one-story structure on the portion of the site, where if there were no prior excavation on the site, a three story structure could be built. The applicant proposes to construct a two story structure over a partially below grade parking garage. The only other method to achieve a two story building would be to have the first floor elevation six feet below grade. This would necessitate window wells and other awkward structural solutions that would cause undesirable living accommodations. Granting the requested variance would allow the applicant the ability to construct modest residential units without inflict undue hardships or practical difficulties.

5. *The requested variance would be consistent with the spirit and purpose of the Land Use Code regulations for the area.*

The spirit and purpose of the Land Use Code is to set forth regulations and procedures for the use of land which are consistent with and implement Seattle's Comprehensive Plan. In the Low Density Multi-family portion of the Plan, land use goals (LG 61 and 62) generally state that opportunities for infill development in areas already characterized by low density development should be provided and that such development should achieve a transition in scale between single family use and more intensive multi-family and commercial uses. Also, policy L95, states that maintaining compatibility with single family development through limits on height and bulk of new development should be considered. The proposal would result in a multi-family structure that would provide a transition in scale between the surrounding single family residences and the more dense co-housing project to the west... The increased height would be consistent with surrounding multi-family residential development. Thus, the bulk and siting of the proposed structure would reflect the existing development trends along this portion of Davis Place S. and more intensive development to the west. Therefore, granting

the requested variances would be consistent with the adopted Land Use Code and reflect the spirit of the policies and goals expressed in the Comprehensive Plan.

DECISION - VARIANCE

The proposed variance to allow a portion of Building One to exceed the maximum height requirement as described is **APPROVED**.

ANALYSIS - SEPA

The initial disclosure of the potential impacts of this project was made in the environmental checklist submitted by the applicant signed October 1, 2002. The information in the checklist plans and the experience of the lead agency with review of similar projects form the basis for this analysis and decision.

The SEPA Overview Policy (SMC 25.05.665 D) clarifies the relationship between codes, policies, and environmental review. Specific policies for each element of the environment, certain neighborhood plans and other policies explicitly referenced may serve as the basis for exercising substantive SEPA authority. The Overview Policy states in part: *"where City regulations have been adopted to address an environmental impact, it shall be presumed that such regulations are adequate to achieve sufficient mitigation"* (subject to some limitations). Under certain limitations or circumstances (SMC 25.05.665 D 1-7), mitigation can be considered. Thus, a more detailed discussion of some of the impacts is appropriate.

Short-term Impacts

Demolition and construction activities could result in the following temporary or construction-related adverse impacts:

- construction dust and storm water runoff;
- erosion;
- increased traffic and demand for parking from construction equipment and personnel;
- increased noise levels;
- occasional disruption of adjacent vehicular and pedestrian traffic;
- decreased air quality due to suspended particulates from building activities and hydrocarbon emissions from construction vehicles and equipment;
- increased noise; and
- consumption of renewable and non-renewable resources.

Several adopted codes and/or ordinances provide mitigation for some of the identified impacts: The Noise Ordinance, the Stormwater Grading and Drainage Control Code, the Street Use Ordinance, and the Building Code. The Stormwater, Grading and Drainage Control Code regulates site excavation for foundation purposes and requires that soil erosion control techniques be initiated for the duration of construction. The Street Use Ordinance requires debris to be removed from the street right-of-way, and regulates obstruction of the

pedestrian right-of-way. Puget Sound Clean Air Agency regulations require control of fugitive dust to protect air quality. The Building Code provides for construction measures in general. Finally, the Noise Ordinance regulates the time and amount of construction noise that is permitted in the city. Compliance with these applicable codes and ordinances will reduce or eliminate most short-term impacts to the environment. However, due to the scale of the project and length of the construction period, additional analysis of potential negative impacts is warranted. Following is an analysis of the short-term impacts to the environment as well as mitigation.

Noise

Noise associated with construction of the buildings could adversely affect surrounding residential uses in the area. Due to the proximity of the project site to these uses, the limitations of the Noise Ordinance are found to be inadequate to mitigate the potential noise impacts. Pursuant to the SEPA Overview Policy (SMC.25.05.665) and the SEPA Construction Impacts Policy (SMC 25.05.675 B), mitigation is warranted.

A general construction schedule and sequence should be provided to the DCLU Land Use Planner for review of the potential noise impacts. The plan should include the proposed truck staging, identification of haul routes and times at which all demolition and/or grading materials will be removed from the site, deliveries and service of equipment will be conducted, and all other construction activities which may have adverse impacts on the adjacent uses.

The following conditions to be enforced during construction shall be posted at each street abutting the site in a location on the property line that is visible and accessible to the public and to construction personnel from the street right-of-way. The conditions shall be affixed to placards prepared by DCLU.

The placards will be issued along with the building permit set of plans. The placards shall be laminated with clear plastic or other waterproofing material and shall remain posted on-site for the duration of construction.

In addition to the Noise Ordinance requirements, to reduce the noise impact of construction on nearby properties, all other construction activities shall be limited to non-holiday weekdays between 7:30 A.M and 6:00 P.M. In addition to the Noise Ordinance requirements, to reduce the noise impact of construction on nearby residences, only low noise impact work such as that listed below, shall be permitted on Saturdays from 9:00 A.M. to 5:00 P.M and on Sundays from 10:00 A.M. to 5:00 P.M.:

- Surveying and layout.
- Stocking the building with any cranes.
- Testing and tensioning P. T. (post tensioned) cables, requiring only hydraulic equipment no cable cutting allowed).
- Other ancillary tasks to construction activities will include site security, surveillance, monitoring, and maintenance of weather protecting, water dams and heating equipment.

Grading, delivery and pouring of concrete and similar noisy activities shall be prohibited on Saturdays and Sundays. Hours on weekdays may be extended from 6:00 P.M. to 8:00 P.M. on a case by case basis, to be approved by DCLU prior to each occurrence.

After each floor of the building is enclosed with exterior walls and windows, interior construction on the individual enclosed floors can be done at other times in accordance with the Noise Ordinance. Such construction activities will have a minimal impact on adjacent uses. Restricting the ability to conduct these tasks would extend the construction schedule, thus the duration of associated noise impacts. DCLU recognizes that there may be occasions when critical construction activities could be performed in the evenings and on weekends, which are of an emergency nature or related to issues of safety, or which could substantially shorten the total construction time frame if conducted during these hours. Therefore, the hours may be extended and/or specific types of construction activities may be permitted on a case by case basis by approval of the Land Use Planner prior to each occurrence. Periodic monitoring of work activity and noise levels may be conducted by DCLU Construction Inspections.

As conditioned, noise impacts to nearby uses are considered adequately mitigated.

Air Quality

Construction is expected to temporarily add particulates to the air and will result in a slight increase in auto-generated air contaminants from construction worker vehicles; however, this increase is not anticipated to be significant.

Federal auto emission controls are the primary means of mitigating air quality impacts from motor vehicles as stated in the Air Quality Policy (Section 25.05.675 SMC). To mitigate impacts of exhaust fumes on the directly adjacent residential uses, trucks hauling materials to and from the project site will not be allowed to queue on streets under windows of the adjacent residential buildings.

Earth

The Stormwater, Grading and Drainage Control Code requires preparation of a soils report to evaluate the site conditions and provide recommendations for safe construction on sites where grading will involve cuts or fills of greater than three feet in height or grading greater than 100 cubic yards of material.

The soils report, construction plans, and shoring of excavations as needed will be reviewed by the DCLU Geotechnical Engineer and Building Plans Examiner who will require any additional soils-related information, recommendations, declarations, covenants and bonds as necessary to assure safe grading and excavation. This project constitutes a "large project" under the terms of the SGDCC (SMC 22.802.015 D). As such, there are many additional requirements for erosion control including a provision for implementation of best management practices and a requirement for incorporation of an engineered erosion control plan which will be reviewed jointly by the DCLU building plans examiner and geotechnical engineer prior to issuance of the permit. The Stormwater, Grading and Drainage Control

Code provides extensive conditioning authority and prescriptive construction methodology to assure safe construction techniques are used, therefore, no additional conditioning is warranted pursuant to SEPA policies.

Grading

An excavation to construct the lower level of the structures will be necessary. Approximately 3,900 cubic yards of material will be excavated and transported. The soil removed will not be reused on the site and will need to be disposed off-site by trucks. City code (SMC 11.74) provides that material hauled in trucks not be spilled during transport.

The City requires that a minimum of one foot of "freeboard" (area from level of material to the top of the truck container) be provided in loaded uncovered trucks which minimizes the amount of spilled material and dust from the truck bed enroute to or from a site.

No further conditioning of the grading/excavation element of the project is warranted pursuant to SEPA policies.

Long-term Impacts

Long-term or use-related impacts are also anticipated as a result of approval of this proposal including: increased surface water runoff due to greater site coverage by impervious surfaces; increased bulk and scale on the site; increased traffic in the area and increased demand for parking; increased demand for public services and utilities; potential loss of plant and animal habitat; and increased light and glare.

Several adopted City codes and/or ordinances provide mitigation for some of the identified impacts. Specifically these are: the Stormwater, Grading and Drainage Control Code which requires on site collection of stormwater with provisions for controlled tightline release to an approved outlet and may require additional design elements to prevent isolated flooding; the City Energy Code which will require insulation for outside walls and energy efficient windows; and the Land Use Code which controls site coverage, setbacks, building height and use and contains other development and use regulations to assure compatible development. Compliance with these applicable codes and ordinances is adequate to achieve sufficient mitigation of most long-term impacts. Further discussion of increased traffic impacts is warranted.

Traffic

The proposal would provide 34 condominium units, 17 one-bedroom units and 17 two-bedroom units. The applicant states that approximately 68 vehicles trips are anticipated as a result of the proposal. The ITE Trips Generation Manual (6th edition) for Residential Condominiums (230) estimates that approximately 114 vehicle trips per day, with 18 PM peak hour trips could be anticipated if this project were to be located in a suburban setting. Since this is an urban site, close to transit and bicycle routes, less traffic is expected than that calculated by using the ITE formula. Access to vehicle parking spaces would be via S. Charles Street, which is a moderately used residential street. On-street parking is available

on all three abutting street. It is not anticipated that the increased number of vehicle trips and the considerable amount of available on-street parking would adversely affect the surrounding streets or neighborhood and therefore, no further mitigation is warranted.

Summary

In conclusion, several adverse effects on the environment are anticipated resulting from the proposal which is non-significant. The construction condition imposed below is intended to mitigate specific impacts identified in the foregoing analysis, or to control impacts not regulated by codes or ordinances, per adopted City policies.

DECISION - SEPA

This decision was made after review by the responsible official on behalf of the lead agency of a completed environmental checklist and other information on file with the responsible department.

This constitutes the Threshold Determination and form. The intent of this declaration is to satisfy the requirement of the State Environmental Policy Act (RCW 43.21.C), including the requirement to inform the public of agency decisions pursuant to SEPA.

- [X] Determination of Non-Significance. This proposal has been determined to not have a significant adverse impact upon the environment. An EIS is not required under RCW 43.21C.030(2)(C).
- [] Determination of Significance. This proposal has or may have a significant adverse impact upon the environment. An EIS is required under RCW 43.21C.030(2)(C).

SEPA CONDITIONS

During Construction

The following conditions to be enforced during construction shall be posted at each street abutting the site in a location on the property line that is visible and accessible to the public and to construction personnel from the street right-of-way. The conditions shall be affixed to placards prepared by DCLU. The placards will be issued along with the building permit set of plans. The placards shall be laminated with clear plastic or other waterproofing material and shall remain posted on-site for the duration of the construction.

1. In addition to the Noise Ordinance requirements, to reduce the noise impact of construction on nearby properties, all other construction activities shall be limited to non-holiday weekdays between 7:30 A.M and 6:00 P.M. In addition to the Noise Ordinance requirements, to reduce the noise impact of construction on nearby residences, only the low noise impact work such as that listed below, shall be

permitted on Saturdays from 9:00 A.M. to 5:00 P.M and on Sundays from 10:00 A.M. to 5:00 P.M.:

- Surveying and layout.
- Stocking the building with the tower crane.
- Testing and tensioning P. T. (post tensioned) cables, requiring only hydraulic equipment (no cable cutting allowed).

Other ancillary tasks associated with construction activities will include site security, surveillance, monitoring, and maintenance of weather protecting, water dams and heating equipment.

Grading, delivery and pouring of concrete and similar noisy activities shall be prohibited on Saturdays and Sundays. Hours on weekdays may be extended from 6:00 P.M. to 8:00 P.M. and additional weekend work may be authorized on a case by case basis. All additional work must be approved by DCLU prior to each occurrence.

DESIGN REVIEW CONDITIONS

Prior to the Issuance of the final building permit

2. Show on the final construction plans:
 - A. Provide a quality material such as hardy board for the structures siding if feasible and a strong color scheme similar to other Home Sight projects in the area. (C-4)
 - B. Break up the continuous mass of Building One along the western facade; provide a continuous ground treatment of the interior courtyard/ landscaping area separating the three modules of Building One. (D2, D3 and D5)
 - C. Provide a gate way feature into p-patch community garden that celebrates the entrance to the garden. (E-3)
 - D. Design a pleasant, usable area if possible in the courtyard/ landscaped space in between modules of Building One. (E-2)

Prior to the Issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy:

3. Compliance with Design Review guidelines and recommendations shall be verified and approved by the DCLU Land Use Planner assigned to this project at the specified development stage, as required in the Director's decision. An appointment with Carol Proud, (206) 233-7197, Sr. Land Use Planner shall be made at least (3) working days in advance of field inspection. The Land Use Planner will determine whether the condition requires submission of additional documentation or a field verification to ensure that compliance has been achieved.

Signature: (signature on file) Date: March 31, 2003

Carol I. Proud
Senior Land Use Planner
Department of Design, Construction and Land Use
Land Use Services